

BALTIMORE SUN

APR 30 1964

CPYRGHT

LIE DETECTOR USES SCORED

Scientific Basis For Tests
Discounted At Hearing

Washington, April 29 (AP) — The supposed scientific basis for lie detectors received a severe buffeting today from four psychiatrists and psychologists. They called use of the instrument often

"unwarranted, dangerous, and degrading."

The scientists, testifying before a House subcommittee on Government operations, were most concerned with the growing use of lie detectors in screening personnel applicants, both in Government and in private business.

"Blindly Probing Instrument"

"I am horrified at its use in personnel screening," Dr. Joseph

Kubis, a professor of psychology at New York's Fordham University, told the subcommittee.

He described the lie detector at times as "a blindly probing instrument that can severely

damage the inner life and reputation of an individual."

Kubis and the other witnesses had less reservations about using the lie detector in crime detection and in screening applicants for jobs requiring the highest security.

But all agreed that, despite the presentations of the lie detector industry, there is no scientific data to prove the validity of the instrument.

Dr. Martin T. Orne, a psychiatrist at Harvard Medical School said it is, in fact, "nonsense" to testify as lie detector experts had done earlier, that their data had proved 99 per cent accurate.

Dr. John I. Lacey, a professor of psychophysiology at Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio, even questioned some of the scientific standing of the instrument itself. It measure blood pressure, respiration, and palm sweating.

Dr. Lacey called it "a fairly crude piece of instrumentation." And he said the manufacturers of lie detectors had made "no attempt to take advantage of the many things we have learned in the last two decades" about physiology, electricity, and computers.

In any case, Dr. Lacey testified, the lie detectors only measure physiological responses, and all an examiner can do is make "inferences" from the data.

He said that in a laboratory situation an examiner, with full background knowledge of the subject and the situation, might be able to make correct inferences.

"In the hurly-burly of true crime detection," Dr. Lacey said, "... there is not by and large this background knowledge available to the examiner."

CPYRGHT